| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/576,285 | 03/06/2007 | Thomas Fraisse | 1512-85 | 9049 |

24106        7590        04/08/2009

EGBERT LAW OFFICES
412 MAIN STREET, 7TH FLOOR
HOUSTON, TX 77002

| EXAMINER |
|---|
| THIAW, CATHERINE B |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 2458 | |

| MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
|---|---|
| 04/08/2009 | PAPER |

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _18 April 2006_.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.    2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are pending in the application.
   4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-20_ is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _18 April 2006 and 06 March 2007_ is/are:  a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
   Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
   Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
   a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
   * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date _08/01/2006_.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
   Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____ .

## DETAILED ACTION

1.    Claims 1-20 are pending.

### *Information Disclosure Statement*

2.    The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 08/01/2006 is being

considered by the examiner.

### *Claim Objections*

3.    The following claims are objected to because their include limitations lacking

antecedent basis:

4.    <u>Claim 3</u> recites "the result of said first step" in line 5, instead of "a result of said

first step";

5.    <u>Claim 11</u> recites "the network" in lines 3 and 5, instead of "the computer

network";

6.    <u>Claim 11</u> recites "on the result" in lines 3 and 7, instead of "on a result";

7.    <u>Claim 18</u> recites ""on the result" in line 2, instead of "on a result";

8.      Claim 20 includes a typographical error in line 2: "activation B" instead of

"activation".

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly
> claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

9.      Claim 3 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being

indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which

applicant regards as the invention.

10.     Claim 3 recites "rapid screening" in line 3 and "greater length" in line 6. While

these limitations are disclosed in the specifications, the degree of rapidity can not be

appreciated from the disclosure, rendering the claim indefinite.

11.     Claim 13 recites also "rapid content screening" in line 2 and "longer duration" in

line 6. The terminology "longer duration" is not used in the specifications and like the

phrase "rapid content screening", renders the claim indefinite, as in claim 3.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12.     _Claims 1-8 and 11-17_ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Liang, U.S. 20010044818, in view of Gutta et al., U.S. 20030126267, hereinafter

Gutta. Gutta is included in the IDS, filed on 08/01/2006.

13.     As to <u>claim 1</u>, Liang discloses a filtering process for online content, said filtering

process (paragraph [0004], lines 1-3) comprising the steps of:

implementing an equipment (paragraph [0024], lines 9-10 and paragraph [0027], lines

2-6: URL cache 18 with a web spider and word list 20 located in client machine 16),

external box or internal computer card, inserted between a computer and a computer

network providing access to online content (paragraph [0020], lines 3-5: proxy server

14), said equipment receiving content from the internet (paragraph [0021], lines 4-7);

analyzing said online content (paragraph [0028], lines 5-10); researching environment

of said online content on said internet (paragraph [0031], lines 1-6); analyzing said

environment (paragraph [0032], lines 1-4); deciding to filter depending on results of the

steps of analyzing said online content and researching environment (paragraph [0040],

lines 1-5); and

transmitting or not of said online content to said computer, depending on a result of

the step of deciding to filter (paragraph [0039], lines 1-5).

14.    However, while Liang teaches a filter engine (paragraph [0023], lines 3-6), Liang

does not explicitly disclose a set of rules for decision-making;

15.    Gutta, in the same field of web content filtering (paragraph [0001], lines 1-5)

teaches a filtering system located at the client side (paragraph [0015], lines 5-8:  set-top

terminal) and a user profile containing internet privileges of each user (paragraph

[0017], lines 1-13), which defines rules for decision making (Fig. 2: for user 205 or 210,

full access means no filtering).

16.    It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time

of the invention to modify the teachings of Liang by the teachings of Gutta, by

associating the filter engine as taught by Liang, with set of rules for decision making as

taught by Gutta, in order to implement a filtering process as disclosed in claim 1. Using

user-defined rules would customize the filtering system according to a user 's

preferences.

17.    As to <u>claim 2</u>, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the process as per

claim 1, wherein, during the step of analyzing said environment, pages reached through

hypertext links of said online content are processed (paragraph [0031], lines 1-6, from

Liang).


18.    As to claim 3, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the process as per

claim 1, wherein the step of analyzing said online content comprises:

a first step of rapid content screening (paragraph [0032], lines 1-3, from Liang: text

screening or paragraph [0020], lines 4-9, from Gutta), with a step of deciding being

comprised of a first step of determining a decision depending on a result of said first

rapid content screening step, in case of non-determination of the result of said first step

of determining a decision (paragraph [0040], lines 1-5, from Liang); and a second step

of screening (paragraph [0051], lines 1-5, from Liang: image analysis or paragraph

[0023], lines 1-3, from Gutta) content of greater length than a first rapid screening step,

with the step of decision then comprising a second step of determinating a decision

depending on a result of the second screening step (paragraph [0061], lines 1-5, from

Liang or paragraph [0026], lines 1-8, from Gutta).


19.    As to claim 4, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the process as per

claim 3, wherein the first step of rapid content screening processes a content containing

no images paragraph [0032], lines 1-3, from Liang: text screening or paragraph [0020],

lines 4-9, from Gutta) and wherein the second step of screening content is comprised of

image processing (paragraph [0051], lines 1-5, from Liang: image analysis or paragraph

[0023], lines 1-3, from Gutta).

20.    As to <u>claim 5</u>, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the process as per

claim 1, wherein at least one step of analyzing comprises:

a step of image processing during which, for at least one image, texture of image

content is analyzed in order to extract the parts of the image where texture matches that

of human flesh (paragraph [0061], lines 1-6, from Liang).

21.    As to <u>claim 6</u>, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the process as per

claim 5, wherein the image processing step is comprised of a step of analyzing a person

or persons whose bodies are partly exposed (paragraph [0061], lines 1-6, from Liang).

22.    As to <u>claim 7</u>, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the process as per

claim 1, wherein at least one step of analyzing is comprised of a step of extracting

characters from images incorporated in the online content (paragraph [0068], lines 1-5,

from Liang and paragraph [0067], lines 1-6, from Liang: extract hyperlinks associated

with images).

23.    As to <u>claim 8</u>, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the process as per

claim 1, further comprising: a step of identifying a user (paragraph [0021], lines 1-3, and

Fig. 2: username 240, from Gutta), and

a step of deactivating filtering and authorization for access to all content accessible on

the computer network depending on the result of identification (paragraph [0017], lines

5-13, from Gutta: a full access would imply authorizing all content).


24.    As to <u>claim 11</u>, Liang discloses an equipment (paragraph [0024], lines 9-10 and

paragraph [0027], lines 2-6: URL cache 18 with a web spider and word list 20 located in

client machine 16), external box or a card inside a computer for filtering online content,

which inserts between the computer and a computer network (paragraph [0020], lines 3-

5: proxy server 14), giving access to online content (paragraph [0021], lines 4-7), said

equipment receiving the content coming from the network (paragraph [0021], lines 2-4),

the equipment comprising: a means for analyzing said content (paragraph [0028], lines

5-10); a means for researching of environment of said content on said network; a

means for analyzing said environment (paragraph [0032], lines 1-4);

a means for deciding to filter, depending on results of analysis of said online content

and said environment (paragraph [0040], lines 1-5); and

a means for transmitting or not said online content to said computer, depending on a

result of the step of deciding to filter (paragraph [0039], lines 1-5).


25.    However, while Liang teaches a filter engine (paragraph [0023], lines 3-6), Liang

does not explicitly disclose a set of rules for decision-making;


26.    Gutta, in the same field of web content filtering (paragraph [0001], lines 1-5)

teaches a filtering system located at the client side (paragraph [0015], lines 5-8:  set-top

terminal) and a user profile containing internet privileges of each user (paragraph

[0017], lines 1-13), which defines rules for decision making (Fig. 2: for user 205 or 210,

full access means no filtering).

27.    It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time

of the invention to modify the teachings of Liang by the teachings of Gutta, by

associating the filter engine as taught by Liang, with set of rules for decision making as

taught by Gutta, in order to implement a filtering process as disclosed in claim 1. Using

user-defined rules would customize the filtering system according to a user's

preferences.

28.    As to claim 12, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the equipment as

per claim 11, wherein said means for analyzing of said environment processes pages

that are reached through hypertext links of said online content (paragraph [0031], lines

1-6, from Liang).

29.    As to claim 13, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the quipment as per

claim 11, wherein at least one means for analyzing said content has been adapted to

perform a first rapid content screening (paragraph [0032], lines 1-3, from Liang: text

screening or paragraph [0020], lines 4-9, from Gutta), the means for decision being

adapted to perform a first determination of decision depending on the result of said first

rapid screening and, in case of non-determination of the result of said first step of

determination of a decision (paragraph [0040], lines 1-5, from Liang), the means for

analyzing has been adapted to perform a second content screening (paragraph [0051],

lines 1-5, from Liang: image analysis or paragraph [0023], lines 1-3, from Gutta) of

longer duration that the first rapid screening, the means of decision-making then

performing a second determination of decision depending on the result of the second

screening (paragraph [0061], lines 1-5, from Liang or paragraph [0026], lines 1-8, from

Gutta).

30.     As to claim 14, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the equipment as

per claim 13, wherein said first rapid content screening processes content that does not

contain any images (paragraph [0032], lines 1-3, from Liang: text screening or

paragraph [0020], lines 4-9, from Gutta) and that the second content screening does

include image processing (paragraph [0051], lines 1-5, from Liang: image analysis or

paragraph [0023], lines 1-3, from Gutta).

31.     As to claim 15, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the equipment as

per claim 11, wherein at least one means for analyzing comprises a means for image

processing that has been adapted, for at least one image, to analyze the texture of the

content of the image in order to extract those portions of the image where the texture

matches that of human flesh (paragraph [0061], lines 1-6, from Liang).

32.     As to <u>claim 16</u>, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the equipment as per claim 15, wherein said image processing includes an analysis of posture of a person or persons whose parts of bodies thereof are visible (paragraph [0061], lines 1-6, from Liang).

33.     As to <u>claim 17</u>, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the equipment as per claim 11, wherein at least on means for analyzing has been adapted for extracting characters from images incorporated into the online content (paragraph [0068], lines 1-5, from Liang and paragraph [0067], lines 1-6, from Liang: extract hyperlinks associated with images).

34.

35.     *<u>Claims 9, 18 and 19</u> are rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Liang and Gutta, in further view of Matz, U.S. 20040255321.*

36.     As to <u>claim 9</u>, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the process as per claim 1, further comprising:

a step of transmission to a remote computer system linked to said computer network, of a set of information being comprised of a command (paragraph [0020], lines 5-8, from Liang) ;and

a step of verification by the remote computer system (paragraph [0023], lines 1-6, from Liang or paragraph [0014], lines 9-10 and 15-17, from Gutta: a proxy server 14 uses the

filtering method) of the rights associated with said identifiers (paragraph [0024], lines 1-6, from Liang and paragraph [0017], lines 1-13], from Gutta) and a step of command to the equipment from a remote computer system to deactivate filtering and to authorize access to all content accessible on the computer network (paragraph [0017], lines 5-13 and Fig. 2, from Gutta: a full access would imply authorizing all content and paragraph [0026], lines 1-5, from Gutta).

37.     However, neither Liang nor Gutta explicitly teaches a user identifier and an equipment identifier.

38.     Matz, in the same field of endeavor, teaches users profiles set in a in a set-top (paragraph [0075, lines 7-13), each profile having an identifier (paragraph [0075, lines 7-13). The user computer is identified by a unique IP address and a set-top box has a unique identifier (paragraph [0085], lines 13-16).

39.     It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Liang and Gutta with the teachings of Matz by identifying user and equipment using a profile identifier and equipment identifiers as taught by Matz, in the filtering system taught by Liang and Gutta. Clients and equipment identifiers would allow the users to be uniquely identified and targeted by remote servers sending contents (paragraph [0085], lines 16-19, from Matz) such as advertisements (paragraph [0086], lines 1-3, from Matz).

40. As to <u>claim 18</u>, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the equipment as per claim 11 and deactivating the filtering and to authorize access to all content accessible on the computer network (paragraph [0017], lines 5-13, from Gutta: a full access would imply authorizing all content).

41. However, neither Liang nor Gutta discloses identification by hardware key.

42. Matz, in the same field of endeavor, teaches users profiles set in a personal computer memory card (paragraph [0065, lines 3-6), each profile having an identifier (paragraph [0075, lines 7-13). The user profile includes contents to be authorized or blocked (paragraph [0062], lines 6-11).

43. It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Liang and Gutta with the teachings of Matz by identifying a user by a hardware key like a card as taught by Matz, in the filtering system taught by Liang and Gutta. Storing clients in a hardware key would allow the filtering system to be implemented in wireless computers.

44. As to <u>claim 19</u>, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the equipment as per claim 1, wherein said means for transmitting to a remote computer system connected to said computer network, a set of information including a command

(paragraph [0020], lines 5-8, from Liang), and a means for receiving, from the remote

computer system (paragraph [0023], lines 1-6, from Liang or paragraph [0014], lines 9-

10 and 15-17, from Gutta: a proxy server 14 uses the filtering method), a command to

the equipment to deactivate the filtering and to grant access to all content accessible on

the computer network (paragraph [0017], lines 5-13 and Fig. 2, from Gutta: a full access

would imply authorizing all content, and paragraph [0026], lines 1-5, from Gutta).

45.    However, neither Liang nor Gutta explicitly teaches a user identifier and an

equipment identifier.

46.    Matz, in the same field of endeavor, teaches users profiles set in a in a set-top

(paragraph [0075, lines 7-13), each profile having an identifier (paragraph [0075, lines

7-13). The user computer is identified by a unique IP address and a set-top box has a

unique identifier (paragraph [0085], lines 13-16).

47.    It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time

of the invention to combine the teachings of Liang and Gutta with the teachings of Matz

by identifying user and equipment using a profile identifier and equipment identifiers as

taught by Matz, in the filtering system taught by Liang and Gutta. Clients and equipment

identifiers would allow the users to be uniquely identified and targeted by remote

servers sending contents (paragraph [0085], lines 16-19, from Matz) such as

advertisements (paragraph [0086], lines 1-3, from Matz).

48.    *Claims 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Liang*
*and Gutta, in further view of Duvall et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,884,033, hereinafter Duvall.*

49.    As to claim 10, the combination of Liang and Gutta discloses the process as per
claim 8.

50.    However, neither Liang nor Gutta teaches an activation step at the next startup of
the computer or at the next opening of a session with said computer.

51.    Duvall, in the same field of content filtering (col. 1, lines 7-8), discloses a filtering
program downloaded by a user from a server (col. 7, lines 29-34), and adding the
program to the startup menu (col. 11, lines 1-3), therefore allowing automatic activation
of the filtering program at startup (col. 11, lines 13-16).

52.    It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time
of the invention to combine the teachings of Liang and Gutta by the teachings of Duvall
by adding the filtering program as taught by Liang and Gutta in the startup menu as
taught by Duvall, in order to implement a filtering process as in claim 10. Such
combination would make the launching of the filtering program easier for the user.

53.    *Claims 20* is rejected under 35 U.S.C 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Liang

*Gutta and Matz, in further view of Duvall.*


54.    As to <u>claim 20</u>, the combination of Liang, Gutta and Matz discloses the

equipment as per either of claims claim 18.


55.    However, the combination of Liang, Gutta and Matz does not teach an activation

step at the next startup of the computer or at the next opening of a session with said

computer.


56.    Duvall, in the same field of content filtering (col. 1, lines 7-8), discloses a filtering

program downloaded by a user from a server (col. 7, lines 29-34), and adding the

program to the startup menu (col. 11, lines 1-3), therefore allowing automatic activation

of the filtering program at startup (col. 11, lines 13-16).


57.    It would have been obvious to a person with ordinary skills in the art at the time

of the invention to combine the teachings of Liang, Gutta and Matz by the teachings of

Duvall by adding the filtering program as taught by Liang, Gutta and Matz in the startup

menu as taught by Duvall, in order to implement a filtering process as in claim 12. Such

combination would make the launching of the filtering program easier for the user.


**Conclusion**

58.    The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure:

59.    Robson et al., U.S. 20040006767 disclose filtering content by having users set

criteria using a set-top box;

60.    Jones et al., U.S. 20030182420 discloses a web site monitor that classifies the

delivers access according to user usage policies;

61.    Donahue, U.S. 20060256788 discloses a content filtering device (router)

between a client and a web provider;

62.    Saeidi, U.S. 20050091328 discloses analyzing content  of sent emails using

keyword to identify inappropriate content;

63.    Chebolu et al., U.S. 20050060581 disclose controlling access to applications

according to user profiles using software at the user side;

64.    Sullivan et al., U.S. 20050028191 and U.S. 20040040034 disclose a parental

locking mechanisms to prevents children from accessing certain media content;

65.     Nii, U.S 20020065730 discloses a card storing user preferences for contents
access.


        Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the
examiner should be directed to CATHERINE THIAW whose telephone number is
(571)270-1138.  The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30--6.

        If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's
supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on 571-272-3949.  The fax phone number
for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

        Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the
Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system.  Status information for
published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.
Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.
For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should
you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic
Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a
USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information
system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/C. T./                                                      04/03/2009
Examiner, Art Unit 2458


/Joseph E. Avellino/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2446